To: Dorothy McGarry

From: Mary Lynette Larsgaard, Chair
ALA/ALCTS/CCS Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access
(CC:DA)

RE: Comments of CC:DA on ISBD(G), 2003 revision

A Task Force (TF) of the American Library Association's Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access has reviewed ISBD(G), 2003 revision; the charge of the TF was to prepare a review of the General International Standard Bibliographic Description (ISBD (G)) 2003 revision, paying particular attention to how the document may affect future directions for AACR2R. The TF's report was discussed by CC:DA, and the following is the result of that discussion. CC:DA's comments on ISBD(G) are in two parts, with the first part being comments that have been approved by CC:DA and the second part being speculative comments about the future of ISBD(G), upon which the Committee had a lively discussion and did not come to agreement.

Form of Report

This report has the following form:

I.   Comments approved by CC:DA: comments on specific aspects of the draft
     revision of ISBD(G)
     A. Effect on end users
     B. Effect on catalogers and libraries
     C. Clarity and consistency in meaning
     D. Document usability
     E. Document readability

II. Speculative comments about the future of ISBD(G), upon which the Committee
     had a lively discussion and did not come to agreement

I. Comments approved by CC:DA: Comments on specific aspects of the draft revision of ISBD(G)

The section numbers refer to existing section numbers in the draft revision.

A. Effect on end users

0.1.1: Since minimal, core, and full-level descriptions are now being used in many ILSs and thus library users are familiar with them, it might be worth considering a two- or three-level standard, for brief/minimal, core, and full user displays. This would be analogous to MARC 21's full and minimal record standards.

0.4.5: If prescribed punctuation is retained, do not treat area 6 differently. Use ". --" between multiple instances of area 6, just as with any other area.

0.8: It is not clear how users benefit from special capitalization rules. Why not just follow the language of the resource for transcribed data, and the language of the catalog for cataloger-generated data? Capitalization as a flag is not always a clean delineation.

1.6 second example: Why was the linking ampersand recorded? Was the ampersand on the chief source?

1.6 second paragraph: It would be worth stating *and others*.

2.4 preceding punctuation: This prescribed punctuation in particular is misleading. In English, the comma generally has more narrow scope than most other punctuation characters. The example at 2.5 shows how confusing this is.

4.3: The TF wondered why this is still limited to distributors. It would be helpful to allow it for publishers and manufacturers as well.

4.5-4.7: These should go away as separate elements, and just become a repeatable instance of area 4. This would allow dates of manufacture that are different than dates of publication to be recorded.

6.5: This element is not consistent, in that it does not allow for ISBNs (of multipart items treated as series) or other standard numbers. From a FRBR perspective, the ISSN is not an attribute of the resource in hand, nor of the relationship between the resource and its parent, the series. It is an attribute of the series itself, and belongs on its bibliographic record in area 8. It would seem that in general this is not helpful to most users. Perhaps it could be part of the standard for full displays, but not for brief displays (see comment at 0.1.1 above).

B. Effect on catalogers and libraries

0.1.3 first paragraph: It seems beyond the scope of the ISBDs to recommend to national cataloging agencies how to structure their metadata records internally. For some agencies, it may be more efficient to create one bibliographic record that represents multiple physical formats, output media or display formats. What the ISBDs might indeed care about is that separate records are distributed.

1.6 second paragraph first sentence: The requirement to give the complete contents in area 7 is onerous; cataloging agencies should be able to decide when to do this work. Perhaps the last sentence, beginning, "Alternatively," is intended to account for onerous situations?

4 note second paragraph: This is much too broad as written, and could lead to wildly divergent practice. What did the writers of ISBD(G) have in mind?

C. Clarity and consistency in meaning

There are allusions in section 0.1 to prescribing the order of data elements, but there are no explicit statements to this effect.

2003 introduction: The section on mandatoriness should appear in the main part of the document. Also, data elements should be labeled in ISBD(G) as mandatory, mandatory if applicable, or optional, at the least stringent designation found in any of the specific ISBDs. The same is true for repeatability. The equivalent of mandatory if applicable appears in the first whole paragraph on p. iv.

The *Invitation to: World-Wide Review of "ISBD(G): General International Standard Bibliographic Description - 2003 revision"* says that *resource* replaces *publication* (assumedly when it means an object, rather than the process of publishing). A couple of places were missed: contents: area 3, 2003 Introduction, footnote 5, 0.3 outline (area 3), 1.5 definition, 3, index.

0.1, footnote 5: It is not clear what this sentence means.

0.2: It is unclear what the value of the term *document* is, since it is only used in the definition of *record*.

0.2: Is *document* meant to be coextensive with the FRBR concepts of *work, expression,* and *manifestation*? If so, it would be clearer to use FRBR verbs: " ... and is created, realized, and/or produced as a whole." If *document* is retained, the phrase *in any medium or combination of media, tangible or intangible*, seems better situated in the definition of *document* rather than that of *resource*.

0.2: Since *corporate body* is not a generally understood term in English, it should be defined.

0.3C, 1.3 note second sentence: It is not clear what *transcribed as such* in 0.3C means. Transcribe as part of the earlier element? Transcribed in full at both elements? How should that sentence in 1.3 be interpreted? Parallel titles are therefore treated as what?

 0.4.3: Indicate how to enter a dash on keyboards (two hyphens?) and printing (em dash?), parallel to the description of entering spaces in 0.4.1.

0.4.4: As written, this section would result in areas (other than area 1) without their first element having two instances of point-space-dash-space. Should this instead be *... is replaced by **the** point, ...*

0.4.6: Modify to *... is preceded **or enclosed** by the ... .*

0.4.6: This section seems to not apply to 4.5-4.7

0.4.8: So commas around a conjunction between the first part of a title proper and the alternative title are not prescribed?

0.4.8A: This section states that square brackets are prescribed punctuation in area 5, but the section on area 5 does not say that.

0.4.8C: This section says parentheses are prescribed punctuation in area 5, but section 5 does not make any such statements.

0.4.9: The relationship between 0.4.9 and other sections is unclear. Does 0.4.9 only apply to 1.3, 2.2, 6.2, and 8.2, where parallel data elements are discussed explicitly? Does it apply to any element?

0.6 first sentence: The *and/or* in this case should be just *and*. Both the language and the script are transcribed.

0.7.1 & 1.5 note last sentence: These sections conflict.

0.7.3 paragraph 2: It seems that the self-reference is really meant to be to 0.7.2.

0.7.4: Perhaps it might be clearer to say *Otherwise, transcribe data in the form (abbreviated or spelled out) in which it appears in the resource.*

0.10 last sentence: It might be better to rephrase as *Letters or numbers that **appear to** have been omitted **inadvertently** from words may be inserted, enclosed in square brackets (in this case not preceded or followed by a space).*

1-8 definitions: There is a difficulty here in that some of the definitions are for an element in a record (such as 1.2 and 4.3), and some are for real-world things (such as 4.2 and 6.6). Sometimes it is an unclear mixture (such as 1.4, 1.5, and 2.1). This gets confusing, especially in training of catalogers. It would be helpful to define the elements as such. If a term that refers to a real-world thing is used in the definition of an element, that term should be defined separately. For example, other title information in a resource and other title information as given as an element are not the same thing. The current definition alludes to this when it mentions other title information for series titles, which are other-title-information-as-thing, but not other-title-information-as-element-1.4. Those are other-title-information-as-element-6.3. The references at the definitions for 6.2-6.4 back to area 1 imply that the definitions in are 1 are for real-world things, not elements.

1-8: The areas would also benefit from definitions. In some sense they are more than the sum of their elements.

1 second sentence: There would be benefit to examining the option of treating alternative titles more like parallel titles, rather than part of the title proper. This is likely closer to how users think of them.

1 second sentence: It would be clearer to say *It includes alternative titles and the conjunction linking an alternative title **with** the first part of the title proper*.

1 third sentence: It would be clearer to say ***If the title of the resource** has a title or designation insufficient to identify it, **its title proper consists of** the title of **its parent** resource, **followed by the title of the resource itself***.

1 third example: The title on the resource does not show commas, but the title proper does show them. Commas are not given as prescribed punctuation for area 1.

1 sixth example: If the purpose of this example is to show how to handle genitives in titles, supporting text would be helpful.

1 last example: Punctuation was changed from the title on the resource to the title proper, but there is not an explicit statement to do that.

1.1: Is this section is missing or mis-numbered? This section is also not present in the 1992 edition.

definitions at 1.4, 1.5, 2.1, 4.2, 4.6, 6.6 second sentence, 8.3: The first few words of each of these should be the same. Perhaps it would be worth defining *statement*.

1.4 definitions 1-2: These sentences contradict each other. The first sentence says that other title information appears in conjunction with the title proper, but the second sentence says it can appear in conjunction other types of titles. It would be clearer to merge them into a single sentence: *A word or phrase, or a group of characters,*

appearing in conjunction with, and subordinate to, a title of the resource. Other title information for series is *not* part of this element, and should not be discussed here.

1.4 definition last sentence: This is confusing. Variant titles are not in the scope of the definition of other title information, so why say this?

1.4 note: The logic and phrasing here is not clear. A same-language original title does not fit the definition of other title information, since it is not subordinate to the title proper. In the previous paragraph, it was just stated that variant titles are *not* other title information. Other parts of the draft seem not to consider analytic titles as other title information.

1.5, etc.: All element names should be given either in the singular or plural.

1.5 first paragraph last sentence: This goes against the generally understood meaning of *statement*, which would already consider that a single statement.

1.5 definition second sentence: So statements of responsibility relating to production should not be given in this element? Would it then follow that the following types of statements would not be considered statements of responsibility: copyists of manuscripts, sponsors of manifestations (such as film producers), the second example in AACR2 1.1F6, engravers of maps?

1.5 note first sentence: Change *punctuation* to *order*.

1.5 note second sentence: Change to *The first statement **does not inherently relate** to the chief responsibility for a work*.

1.5 note third sentence: Change to *A statement of responsibility **may not name a specific** person or body*.

1.5 Madame Bovary example: The phrase *after the novel by Flaubert* fits the definition of other title information, not statement of responsibility.

1.5 last example: The interpolated *par* does not seem to be called for by any part of the standard.

2.1 definition: This is a circular definition that does not help in the understanding of the term.

2.1 note: This would be very difficult for catalogers to follow as written. Who can really know anything about "all the copies of a resource"? This note cries out for FRBRization.

2.1 note last sentence: The definition of each data element should be the same for all materials. The specific ISBDs certainly benefit from examples of how the concept of *edition* plays out in various formats.

preceding punctuation at 2.3 & 2.5: Either give both here, or refer from both to 1.5.

2.3 definition: This would also be very difficult for catalogers to follow as written. The cataloger often does not know whether a statement has appeared in all editions, and certainly cannot know whether it will be used in all future editions.

2.3 note: This is also not always easy to follow. A resource may have an edition statement that is not clearly chronological, such as *Conference edition* or S*tudent edition*.

2.4 definition: This combines two very different kinds of data that are not usefully merged into a single element.

2.4 definition A: This definition does not make sense, given the definition at 2.1. Also, *issue* should be defined.

4 note first sentence: Change *library materials* to *resources*.

4.1 In London example: The *In* does not fit the definition. If this example is to be viewed as correct, the definition needs to be changed, and perhaps the name of the element (to *Statement of place of publication, distribution, etc.*).

4.2 definition, etc.: Change *or* to *and/or*.

5.3: The definition needs to be broadened to incorporate phrases such as *in glazed case* in the second example.

5.4: This should be broken down into sub-elements. As written, internal prescribed punctuation is not appropriate.

8.1: The definition is missing, or buried in the note. There is also a slight difference between the draft ISBD (G) and AACR; ISBD(G) states, "When a resource bears an ISBN for a group of which it is a part, as well as an individual ISBN, the group ISBN is given after the individual number," while AACR2 at 1.8B2 in the Optionally paragraph states, "Give a number for a complete set before the number(s) for the part(s)."

Appendix A first sentence & examples B: These two sections do not agree on the scope of multilevel description.

Appendix A examples A second example: There is no provision in 4.4 for two dates to given in this element, or for the parentheses.

D. Document usability

Either give all page numbers in Arabic, or restart numbering when Arabic starts.

Do not repeat statements throughout the document. Standards are best written as concisely as possible. Repeating information, when stated slightly differently, often leads readers to assume that there is some subtle difference in meaning.

Topic	Recommended instance(s) to retain	Other instance(s)
order of elements	0.1	1-8
parentheses enclosing elements	0.3, 0.4.2, & 1-8	0.4.8C
square brackets enclosing elements	0.3 & 1-8	0.4.8A s1
Prescribed plus sign	0.3 & 5.4	0.4.8D
Spacing	0.4.1-0.4.2	1-8
preceding punctuation for areas	0.4.3	0.3 note
ellipses indicating omissions	0.4.8B	0.7.1 s2
parallel data	0.4.9	0.3 & 1-8
nature of examples	0.9	0.7.3 2nd paragraph, 5 2nd paragraph, 1st sentence
parallel series titles	6.2	1.3 definition
principle of transcription	non-language parts of 0.6	2.1 note next-to-last paragraph 1st sentence, 4.1 definition (*as named on the resource*), etc.

The nature of the examples in this document is inconsistent, and not always as helpful as could be. CC:DA suggests that examples at each element should contain <u>only</u> that element. Then, at the end of each area, there could be examples of whole areas.

It would also be helpful if examples were given with both the form in the resource and the form recorded, as was done at 1. This would clarify that portions of certain examples were indeed transcribed, not generated by the cataloger.

Example	Portion not clear whether transcribed or cataloger-generated
1.2 second	the conjunction and its punctuation
1.5 Handley Cross	the single quotation marks

0.2 third paragraph: There are benefits and drawbacks to the two possibilities here, either to place all definitions here, or to spread them throughout the document. On the positive side for having definitions in one place is the point that it makes it easier to

find a definition when it is needed. For example, ISO standards now have all definitions in their own section before the main text.

0.3 areas 3 & 7: It would be helpful to have text here saying to see the specific ISBDs for elements and punctuation.

0.4.5, 0.4.6: It would be more concise to integrate 0.4.5 into 0.4.3, and 0.4.6 into 0.4.1. For example, modify the beginning of 0.4.3 to *Each instance of an area....*

0.11, last sentence: The first part of the sentence should include a reference to 0.4.8A. The last part of the sentence would be more appropriately located somewhere in section 7.

1-8: It would be more logical to put definitions in each subsection before prescribed punctuation.

1-8: Some sections outside of 7 (such as 6.1) give instruction on when to record something in area 7, but not in all cases which may apply (or even all the most common ones). Perhaps it would be best to either give none, or at each area, so as not to give the impression that some are more important than others or that only a few exist.

1: It would be helpful to treat the parts of the title proper element for a common title/section title situation as sub-elements. Each piece could then be defined, discussed, and exemplified separately: title of parent resource, numbering, title of the child resource.

1.2: The practice of giving *GMD* as the GMD is not helpful. Real GMDs should be used in examples. We don't do this for any other element, in particular the SMD. It is not clear how the current practice is helpful.

1.3 note third sentence: This is already clearly in the scope of the definition, so should be deleted.

1.6 second paragraph second sentence: It would be worthwhile to give an example of this.

3 note second paragraph second sentence: Delete this, as it will get out synch when new area 3s are defined.

4 note: Pull out the definition and label it as such.

5.1 footnote 7: This does not add any value to this section, and should be deleted.

5.1: It would be easier and more consistent to treat parenthesized parts as a separate element.

6.1 note first and second sentences: If common and dependent titles are to be used here, it would seem that actual text should be given. It seems odd for ISBD(G) to refer to a specific ISBD for instruction that can apply to all material.

Appendix A second sentence: There are no examples "see".

E. Document readability

2003 introduction, first sentence: A space is needed between *to* and *1969*.

0.1 footnote 5: This references section 1.2.3, which does not exist in this document.

0.2 third paragraph: Using a comma after *ISBD(G)* would eliminate a reader interpreting the beginning of the sentence as *In the definitions within ISBD(G) ... .*

0.3 element 6.4: The semicolon should not be italicized.

0.4.1 last sentence: *In certain cases* does not add value to the sentence, and can be deleted.

0.4.8A first paragraph second sentence: This would be more concise as *Square brackets enclose information not found in the prescribed sources of information (see 0.5, 0.6, 0.7.2, 0.10, 0.11).* There is one principle here; the current sentence makes it look like there are two.

0.4.8D: This does fit in this section, as it cannot *be used in all or most areas*. Also, the introductory sentence in 0.4.8 says three punctuation symbols, not four.

1 examples: These would be easier to read if they were shown something like this:

    title of a motion picture:
        Non-destructive inspection - a dollar saving diagnostic tool

    title proper:
        Non-destructive inspection

    title of a sound recording:
        L'Ascension, hymne pour grand orchestre

    title proper:
        L'Ascension

    etc.

3 note first paragraph: Condense this paragraph to:

> This area **appears** in **some of** the specialized ISBDs. **It** contains data that are unique to a particular class of library material or type of publication.

6: Delete *or sub-series* throughout this section, as it is superfluous.

8.1 note first paragraph last sentence: Delete the duplicate period.

Appendix A examples A last example: Indent the second-level description.

II. Speculative comments about the future of ISBD(G), upon which CC:DA did not come to agreement

Overview statement from the TF's original report

The TF perceived that the main issue it faced was the extent, purpose and potential impact of the review. If the TF had looked only for areas in which AACR2R and the guidelines are not in conformance, it would have issued a rather brief report, since the TF found the revised ISBD(G) to be generally consistent with AACR2R (with some areas of concern). The TF chose to step back and take a broader view, and came up with at least two questions arise more substantive and more controversial nature.

The stated goal of this ISBD(G) revision is to ensure conformity between the provisions of the ISBDs and FRBR's data requirements for the basic level national bibliographic record (BLNR). The TF report recommended that a harder look be taken at the job the ISBDs do in creating what we want to see in our national records. In the environment of 2004, many of the directives in ISBD(G) seem anachronistic. To remain viable, the ISBDs need to be revised to keep current with the effects and functionality of technology, while continuing to be usable in a print environment, as well as with expectations of modern users and library staff.

The second major area of discussion for the committee was the incorporation of the FRBR model. It seems that a review of the ISBDs to ensure compliance with FRBR would have been an ideal time to utilize the more rigorous terminology of that standard, in particular *work, expression, manifestation,* and *item*. It seems especially unfortunate that ISBG(G) partially adopts the FRBR model, but not sufficiently to lay out clearly the relationship between the ISBDs and the FRBR model. The TF report endorsed the ISBD Review Group's idea to make the relationship clear, via a table or other method. It is regrettable that users of both standards would need to consult a table in order to interpret them. It would be much better to fully incorporate FRBR (as well as other relevant IFLA standards, such as *Guidelines for OPAC Displays*) into the ISBDs directly.

The TF report recognized that the 2003 revision is an interim document and that work may be needed to determine which of the recommendations below are appropriate for the current review and which may be more appropriate for future discussion. The impact of some suggestions on AACR2R could be considerable.

II.A.   Effect on end users

General statement

The TF report recommended the following:

When there is a concept in the standard, the term we use for it should be in the language of the standard. If a term exists in common parlance, that term should be used; if it does not, but common terms may be combined in a way that regular users of the language would likely understand, that term should be used. Only if neither of these approaches work should cataloging rules and guidelines include a "made-up" word, or a phrase whose meaning would not generally be immediately understandable to most users. Since space is not the problem it was in card catalog days, there is substantially less motivation to use prescribed abbreviations. This is especially true for words that users will see in the online catalog. For many years, it has not been accurate to assume that the majority of users know Latin words and abbreviations. It is time to switch to terms in the language of the catalog. The TF report recommended:

Existing term	Recommended term
i.e.	that is
title proper	citation title
other title information	Subtitle
et al.	And others
s.l.	[nothing; do not give the element]
s.n.	[nothing; do not give the element]

Some non-TF members of CC:DA did agree that the case for using traditional abbreviations and terms should be re-examined. There was not agreement as to the terms in the table; for example, "i.e." is in general usage, and "other title information" is not always a subtitle.

0.1.1: What kind of standard are the ISBDs trying to be? The last sentence implies that one primary purpose is displays. This raises the question: What is the intended relationship between the ISBDs and IFLA's *Guidelines for OPAC Displays*?   As written it seems to be confined to eye-readable punctuation flags.

0.1.2, etc.: The TF report strongly recommended the use of labeled displays, in the following: "The use of punctuation to delimit data elements is generally unfamiliar to users. It seems time for the ISBDs to call for labeled displays, in the language of the catalog. For shared electronic records, system tagging can be used to generate the

displays. For shared printed records, a page of translations from the language of the source cataloging agency to one of IFLA's official languages would suffice in helping destination cataloging agency to interpret the records. OCR scanning for metadata extraction would mostly be used for older records which are only available in print form." Opinions of other CC:DA members were equally strongly that: labeled displays are appropriate for the IFLA document on metadata displays; and there does not appear to be consensus – even within ALA – on what a normative online display should be.

0.1.3 third paragraph from end, etc.: The TF report spoke in favor of broadening the scope of the ISBDs: "It also seems anachronistic now to limit the ISBDs to what the library community calls *description*. With the plethora of metadata standards created outside of our field (and some inside as well), *descriptive metadata* includes elements corresponding to our descriptive headings, subjects, etc. It is time for us to have one over-arching standard for bibliographic records. AACR Part III will be defining authority records, in part to deal with bibliographic relationships. MARC21 tagging in 7XX fields provides for a number of relationships. ISBD(G) also does not seem to be defining a way to show the work-entity-manifestation relationships. There is no area at all for subject access yet FRBR says to provide them It may now be time to suggest that new Areas be considered for ISBD(G)."

0.5: The TF report spoke in favor of looking at the purposes of transcription: "It might benefit us to look at our principles of transcription. Are our users best served by transcription? Are there situations where cataloger's judgment in how to record information would be more beneficial? Some on the TF think that we should move way from transcription as our principle for the data we give in our records, at least for some elements, e.g., omit statements of responsibility, and rely on access points. This ties into discussions of the need for role information such as relator terms." There was strong disagreement from other CC:DA members at moving away from exact transcription, except possibly for minimal-level records. One CC:DA member suggested a digital image of the chief source as a part of or to accompany the catalog record.

1.6: The TF report suggested methods of dealing with resources containing more than one work: "Users would likely be better served by an approach where each work is given its own line (that is, repeated area 1s). Since some elements relate to more than one work, the list could be headed by some generic phrase. For example, using some of the examples at 1.6:

"This resource consists of multiple titles. They are [GMD] / Haydn
    "Clock" symphony : (no. 101)
    "Surprise" symphony : (no. 94)

"This resource consists of multiple titles. They are [GMD] / by Charles Dickens ; with seven illustrations by F. Walker and Maurice Greiffenhagen
    Hard times

Hunted down
Holiday romance
George Silverman's explanation

"This resource consists of multiple titles. They are [GMD]
Saudades do Brasil : suite de danses pour orchestre / Darius Milhaud
Symphonie concertante pour trompette et orchestre / Henry Barraud "

Non-TF members of CC:DA noted that we need a better way to identify for users that a bibliographic resource contains more than one work, but the alternatives suggested by the TF mean that the statement of responsibility fits in awkwardly, and the examples thus seem confusing.

8.2: The TF report noted a difficulty seeing how key title would be of benefit to end users: "….There are many, many data elements that are useful to specific sets of users at some institutions, but we don't include them. The ISBDs outline the minimum of elements to display and it is always possible to add others." There was not agreement that key titles are not of use, although mainly for continuing resources.

[COMMENTS FROM EMAIL:
STEVEN:
I agree with the general points ("Do not repeat statements" ; give examples with both the form in the resource and the form recorded). The alternative numbering recommended I feel I can't comment on given the short turnaround time.
KRISTIN:
Although a different numbering scheme for the ISBD(G) may be desirable, this suggestion has an impact on all of the ISBDs and not just ISBD(G).
Not sure it's worth the trouble to renumber these documents and I like having the area numbers match their section numbers. Perhaps just improve section 0 somehow?]

The TF recommended a different numbering system for the sections:

"It is apparent that the section numbers were constructed in order to have area numbers match their section numbers, but this benefit is outweighed by the cost of illogical section hierarchies in section 0. Start section numbering with 1, and subdivide the number of the section on areas (whatever that ends up being) by area number."

Other CC:DA members, although noting that a different numbering scheme for ISBD(G) may be advisable, such a renumbering would have significant impact on all of the ISBDs and thus would need to be very carefully considered. Also, the current numbering system, in which the area numbers match the section numbers, has its benefits.

Here is the TF report's suggested structure. Section numbers in the brackets are the existing structure.

1. Introduction
   1.1. Scope [0.1.1]
   1.2. Purpose [0.1.2]
   1.3. Use [0.1.3]
   1.4. Examples [0.9]
2. Definitions [0.2]
3. General
   3.1. Order [data appears in the order described in this document; 4.4 note second sentence, 8 note, etc.]
   3.2. Applicability [relevant sections from 2003 introduction, 0.4.10]
   3.3. Identifying parts of the description
      3.3.1. Delimiting areas [0.4.3]
      3.3.2. Delimiting elements [0.4.1 first sentence & last sentence; 0.4.4]
      3.3.3. Delimiters adjacent to other delimiters or transcribed punctuation [0.4.1 fourth sentence; 0.4.7]
      3.3.4. Other delimiters and indicators
         3.3.4.1. Information found outside the prescribed sources of information [0.4.8A first paragraph second sentence, second paragraph]
         3.3.4.2. Omission of some part of an element [0.4.8B]
         3.3.4.3. Additions [relevant parts of 0.10]
      3.3.5. Spacing around delimiters [0.4.1 second sentence; 0.4.2]
      3.3.6. Delimiters in right-to-left text [0.4.11]
      3.3.7. Optional delimiters [0.4.1 third sentence]
   3.4. Units of data [generalized version of 1.5 first paragraph last sentence]
4. Areas and elements
   4.0. General elements
      4.0.1. Parallel elements [generalized statement, drawing on 0.4.9, 1.3, 2.2, 6.2, 8.2; not repeated in 4.1-4.8]
   4.1. Area 1 [1]
      4.1.0. Resources without a collective title [1.6]
      4.1.1. Element 1 [what should have been 1.1]
      ...
   ...
5. Element values
   5.1. Sources of information
      5.1.1. Transcription [general principle, 0.5, 0.7.4]
      5.1.2. Data supplied by the cataloger [general principle, list of elements, such as 1.2, 2.1]
   5.2. Language and script
      5.2.1. Transcribed data [0.6 first paragraph first sentence, third paragraph bullet 2, etc.]

       5.2.2.   Non-transcribed data [0.6 first paragraph second sentence &
            bullets, third paragraph & bullets 1 & 3, etc.]
     5.3. Modifying data
       5.3.1.   Punctuation [reference to 0.4.7]
       5.3.2.   Capitalization [0.8]
       5.3.3.   Form of numerals [generalized 2.1 note next-to-last paragraph
            third sentence]
       5.3.4.   Abridgement [0.7.1 first sentence]
       5.3.5.   Abbreviation [0.7.2 & 0.7.3]
       5.3.6.   Inaccuracies and mistakes [parts of 0.10 not moved to new 3.3.4.3]
       5.3.7.   Characters that cannot be utilized fully [0.11, 0.6 fourth paragraph]
   Appendixes
     A   Outline of ISBD(G) areas and elements [0.3 outline]
     B   Multilevel description [Appendix A]
     C   Records containing scripts with different directionality [Appendix B]"

[COMMENTS FROM EMAIL:
STEVEN:
It seems to me that if ISBD(G) is intended to be translated into multiple languages, it would be costly to come up with appropriate examples in a single language for each translation, hence the examples are in different languages, with the understanding that the same examples can be used in all of the translations. Also, if different examples were used in different translations, this might open up more possibilities for misinterpreting the rule the examples are meant to demonstrate. (Or is it in fact the standard practice to use different examples when ISBD(G) is translated?)
There were a couple of places where some of the comments still sound like internal TF notes, e.g. p. 7 1-8 definitions; 1 last example; p. 9, D. 2nd paragraph. Should those be cleaned up?
Finally, is it likely that ISBD revisions would ever be coordinated with AACR revisions? If it were likely that some of these recommendations were accepted, it would be a shame that the AACR revision would not be able to incorporate them due to scheduling. Or maybe the question would need to be raised as to whether AACR2 has to be in harmony with ISBD(G)?
KRISTIN:
second paragraph. I don't agree that non-English examples aren't
helpful. Since the ISBDs do not seem to be translated into every language
according to the IFLA site, I assume many other countries use the English
version and examples in other languages would then be appropriate.]

0.9 second paragraph: The TF report suggested that examples should be in the language and script of the ISBD(G) document itself: "It would seem that the examples would generally be most useful if they are in the language and script of the ISBD(G) document itself. For example, it is not clear what the value of non-English examples is in this English document, beyond showing parallel information. This

paragraph could be rewritten as *Examples are given in the language and script of this document, unless showing how to handle text in other languages or scripts.*"

There was strong disagreement by other CC:DA members, who noted the following: a) if ISBD(G) is intended to be translated into multiple languages, it would be costly to come up with appropriate examples in a single language for each translation, hence the examples are in different languages, with the understanding that the same examples can be used in all of the translations; b) if different examples were used in different translations, this might open up more possibilities for misinterpreting the rule the examples are meant to demonstrate (unless it is in fact the standard practice to use different examples when ISBD(G) is translated); and c) since the ISBDs do not seem to be translated into every language according to the IFLA site, I assume many other countries use the English version and examples in other languages would then be appropriate.